

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4 and 7-21 are pending. Claims 1, 4, 11 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), and claims 7-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claim Rejections

A. The Examiner has again rejected claims 1, 4, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Asakura et al.* (US 5,808,260, hereinafter “*Asakura*”).

1. Claims 1 and 4

Independent claim 1 recites that a part of the conductor that comes in contact with the connecting face of the contact is formed as a flat surface.

The Examiner maintains that the electrodes 6 and 7 or 8 and 9 of *Asakura* disclose the claimed electrodes and wire 3 discloses the claimed conductor (Fig. 1). However, when comparing the contact of electrodes 8 and 9 with the conductor 3 of Figures 6 and 7 of *Asakura*, it is shown that the conductors 8 and 9 actually contact the rounded upper surface of the alleged conductor. Further, Figure 1 of *Asakura* merely discloses that “one” of the two electrodes (i.e., electrode 6) contacts the alleged flat surface of the conductor. Claim 1 specifically recites that “said electrodes” (plural) contact with the flat surface. Since *Asakura* fails to disclose that both of the electrodes 6 and 7 of *Asakura* contact with the flat surface of the alleged conductor and fails to disclose that the electrodes 8 and 9 both contact with the rounded surface of the alleged conductor, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over *Asakura*.

Also, Applicant has incorporated the features of claim 4 into claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant has canceled claim 4 without prejudice or disclaimer.

2. Claims 11 and 12

Independent claim 11 recites that the pair of electrodes is shaped to weld and apply pressure to each of the groupings of conductors and contacts “at the same time.”

In regard to the above claimed features, the Examiner cites to column 4, lines 45-62 of Asakura and maintains that such portion discloses that the electrodes 8 and 9 can move so as to weld a plurality of contacts and conductors (pg. 3 of Office Action). However, as specifically recited in claim 11, the pair of electrodes weld the groupings “at the same time.” In this regard, Applicant refers the Examiner to the non-limiting embodiment of Figure 4 of the present Application. The electrodes 6-9 of Asakura are disclosed as being tapered and narrow at the tips (col. 5, lines 21-24). Accordingly, the electrodes 6-9 are not capable of welding a plurality of groupings of the conductors and contacts at the same time.

At least based on the foregoing, Applicant submits that claim 11 is patentable over the cited reference.

Further, Applicant has incorporated the features of claim 12 into claim 11. Accordingly, Applicant has canceled claim 12 without prejudice or disclaimer.

B. The Examiner has again rejected claims 7, 9 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Asakura*.

1. Claims 7 and 9

Applicant submits that claim 7 is patentable over the cited reference for at least analogous reasons as claim 1.

Also, since the features of claim 9 have been incorporated into claim 7, Applicant has canceled claim 9 without prejudice or disclaimer.

2. Claim 18

Since claim 18 is dependent upon claim 1, Applicant submits that such claim is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

C. The Examiner has again rejected claims 8, 10 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Asakura* in view of *JP 60-50079* (hereinafter *JP '079*).

1. Claims 8 and 10

Claim 8 contains analogous features as recited in claim 1. Since *JP '079* fails to cure the deficient teachings of *Asakura*, in regard to claim 1, Applicant submits that claim 8 is patentable for at least analogous reasons as claim 1.

Also, since the features of claim 10 have been incorporated into claim 8, Applicant has canceled claim 10 without prejudice or disclaimer.

2. Claim 19

Since claim 19 is dependent upon claim 1, and JP '079 fails to cure the deficient teachings of Asakura, in regard to claim 1, Applicant submits that claim 19 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

D. The Examiner has rejected claims 13-17 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over newly cited reference *Ozai* (US Pub 2003/0065625, hereinafter *Ozai*) in view of *Asakura*.

1. Claims 13 and 20

Independent claim 13, as filed, recites a “base having a plurality of conductive contacts,” and “a cable main body including a plurality of wire conductors that connect respectively to the plurality of contacts.”

Ozai discloses a multiconductor connector 1 connected to ground contact plates 5 and signal contact plates 4 (Figure 1). The connector 1 also has drain wires 9 which are connected to the ground contact plates 5. However, as acknowledged by the Examiner, *Ozai* fails to disclose that a flat surface of the conductors contacts with the respective contacts. Accordingly, the Examiner refers to *Asakura* to cure this deficient teaching.

The alleged flat face of the conductor 3a of *Asakura* is provided due to crimping of the core portion 3a of the alleged conductor into the caulking portion 2a of the alleged contact 2. Based on the configuration as shown and described in *Ozai*, one skilled in the art would not be

motivated to “crimp” the conductor 7 of Ozai with a caulking portion to connect with the contact plates 4, 5. The structure taught by each reference is fundamentally different. Thus, Applicant submits that one skilled in the art would not be motivated to modify Ozai with Asakura in the manner set forth by the Examiner.

At least based on the foregoing, Applicant submits that claim 13 is patentable over the cited references. Also, since claim 20 is dependent upon claim 13, Applicant submits that such claim is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

2. Claims 14-17

Applicant has canceled claims 14-17, without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the rejection of such claims is now moot.

E. Finally, the Examiner has rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ozai*, *Asakura* and *JP '079*.

Since claim 21 is dependent upon claim 13, and *JP '079* fails to cure the deficient teachings of *Ozai* and *Asakura*, in regard to claim 13, Applicant submits that claim 21 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.


Amendment under 37 C.F.R. §1.116
U.S. Application No. 10/510,031

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Allison M. Tulino
Registration No. 48,294

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 1, 2006